NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,
AND PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

"HOW BEAUTIFUL UPON THE MOUNTAINS, ARE THE FEET OF HIM THAT BRINGETH GOOD TIDINGS, THAT PUBLISHETH PEACE."—Isa. lii, 7.

VOL. III. SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1833. NO. 4.

PUBLISHED SIMULTANEOUSLY IN NEW-YORK AND PHILADELPHIA.

EDITED BY
T. J. Sawyer, A. C. Thomas and P. Price.

P. PRICE, PUBLISHER AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS—Two Dollars per ann. in advance, or $2,50 if not paid within six months. Publishing offices No. 2 Marble-Building, Chatham-Square, (foot of the Bowery) New-York, and No. 132 Chesnut-street, Philadelphia.

Letters to be addressed, (post paid) "P. Price, No. 2 Chatham-Square, New-York."

A SERMON.

BY HOSEA BALLOU, BOSTON.

I have occasioned the death of all the persons of thy father's house. 1 Sam. xxii, 22.

Among the numerous subjects of controversy, which have engaged the attention of polemic writers, and which have caused divisions in the Christian church, no one has been more signalized, or become more prominent than the question, whether the Supreme Being can properly be said to be the author of *all things*, in the most extensive view of the words. While that class of doctors, which have, for ages, defended the system of divinity, which embraces the doctrine of the foreordination of all things, have found no difficulty in confounding the advocates of the opposite hypothesis, they have never been able to free their own creed from objections, no less embarrassing, than those with which they confounded their opposers. The predestinarian, by urging the foreknowledge of God in all things, which the Arminian doctors could not deny, have been able to demonstrate the *certainty* of all events as clearly as this certainty is established by the hypothesis of predestination. This argument the Arminian has never been able to overcome. But though he could never satisfy the predestinarian that human agency could possibly go contrary to the divine prescience, he could put him to utter confusion by showing that by the doctrine of foreordination, God is made the author of all the sin, which wicked beings have committed. And then, making use of a proposition which they both allow, that sin deserves and must receive an infinite and an endless punishment, he presents the appalling absurdity to his adversary, of the foreordination of sin by the Divine Being, and also the foreordination of this infinite punishment for sin!

We have here in plain view, the great and embarrassing subject of controversy, and even of contention, which has divided the christian church for ages; and if we carefully observe, we may easily discover, where all the difficulty lies. Why does the Arminian, or what we now call the free-willer, wish to find that agency in man for which he contends? The fact is, he wants it for the sole purpose of making out on the one hand, the justice of the sinner's endless punishment; and on the other, he wishes to free the Divine Being from that cruel character which is given him by the doctrine which makes him the author of the sin for which he condemns the sinner to endless sufferings. The Arminian has not been able to discover, nor has the predestinarian shown him, that could he find in man any agency which he should choose to describe, it would then be necessary to allow that this agency, being constituted by the Creator, must have been designed by him for a definite purpose, which purpose could not fail of being effected. So, after all, he involves himself in the same appalling absurdity with which he confounds his adversary. For there is no moral difference in saying that our heavenly Father is the author of that sin for which he condemns his children to endless suffering, and saying that he is the author of that agency which he designed should eventually terminate in the same result.

But the whole difficulty would be removed at once, if the doctors, on both sides of the controversy, could come to the conclusion to leave out of the christian creed the hypothesis of endless punishment. To maintain this erroneous proposition the predestinarian becomes confounded with the relentless cruelty, in which he involves the Divine Being; and to maintain the same offensive doctrine, the Arminian confuses himself with the ignorance, which his doctrine attributes to Him who knows all things. What objection could the Arminian bring to the doctrine of predestination, could he first free his own mind from the doctrine of endless punishment, and then find no such error in the system of predestination? There must surely be something besides the dictates of enlightened reason, and the aspirations of a benevolent heart, which would raise objections to the doctrine which teaches that God predetermined all events, and overrules them all for the ultimate good of all his creatures.

With a view to bring this all-important subject before my hearers this morning, and to furnish some arguments for the support of the right of the case, the text, which has been read, was selected. But the query may arise,—What has the text to do with the subject? In reply, we say, that the text stands in support of the doctrine, that contends that the cause of what is called evil may be innocent.

In his flight from the unrighteous vengeance of Saul, king of Israel, David, destitute of provision and of armour, came to Nob, to Abimilech the priest, who not knowing that his majesty was offended with so worthy a servant as he supposed David to be, accommodated him with a supply of holy bread, as he had no other, and gave him also the sword which David took from Goliah, when he slew him. Thus provided, David continued his flight from Saul. But Doeg, the Edomite, was present when the priest accommodated David, and afterwards informed Saul of the fact, and accused Abimilech to his majesty.—The king was enraged against the priest and demanded of him thus: "Why have ye conspired against me, thou and the son of Jesse, in that thou hast given him bread, and a sword, and hast inquired of God for him that he should rise against me, to lie in wait, as at this day?" It was in vain that Abimilech pleaded his innocence, saying; "And who is so faithful among all thy servants as David, which is the king's son-in-law, and goeth at thy bidding, and is honorable in thine house? Did I then begin to inquire of God for him? be it far from me. Let not the king impute any thing unto his servant, nor to all the house of my father: for thy servant knew nothing of all this, less or more." Absolute power, which is not amenable to law, when exercised by enraged majesty, is deaf to all the eloquence of innocence, and dooms to destruction without the semblance of justice, or the feelings of humanity. The following sentence was immediately pronounced: "Thou shalt surely die, Abimilech, thou, and all thy father's house." Such was the odious character of this wicked sentence, that Saul's footmen, when commanded to slay the priest of the Lord, refused. Doeg, in the spirit of his master, accomplished this memorable massacre, and put to death, that day, eighty-five persons who wore the linen ephod. He moreover destroyed the city of Nob, old and young, male and female, and even the cattle. One son of Abimilech alone escaped and came to David, and informed him of the whole of this tragedy. David, in reply, told Abiather that he knew, when he was with his father, that Doeg would inform Saul of what transpired, and told him that he had been the occasion of the death of all the persons of his father's house; but at the same time promised him protection.

Having so far attended to the history, in which our subject is found, we may proceed to examine the moral character of David, in relation to the murderous scene which we have described. Was David the innocent cause of this murder, or was he the criminal cause? Here there can be but one answer. David was the innocent cause of this outrageous piece of wickedness. But the question will be asked, was there a criminal cause of the same wicked outrage? Here again there can be no doubt. If there had been no criminal design, the act could not have been morally wrong. The act of taking life, as well as all other acts, is innocent, or criminal according to the design of the principal agent, who performs the act. But Saul and Doeg were unquestionably criminal, in relation to this affair; and it is very evident that they were important agents in it.

The discerning hearer will now grow apprehensive that the nice point—that pivot on which this general subject must turn, is going to be either overlooked, or kept out of the argument. It is very clear, that in order for our reasoning to result in showing that God is the innocent cause of all things; it must be shown that he is the innocent cause even of criminality itself. We have no fears on this subject, no wish to hide behind some insolvable mystery. Let us then examine the case of Saul and David. Saul was determined to take the life of David; and such was the strength of this determination and the fury which accompanied it, that whatever seemed to stand in the way to restrain the course of his vengeance, became subject to it. This in Saul was criminal; it was the dictate of envy. David had done nothing at which Saul was offended; but his loyalty to the king, his love of his country's freedom, and above all, his sacred regard to the character of the God of Israel, had acquired him a fame, which eclipsed the glory of Saul and kindled the fire of jealoussy in his heart.

In the movements of David there appears nothing that was reprehensible—Goliath had for forty days shown himself from the front of the Philistine army, proudly vaunting, and defying the host of Israel. He proposed to decide the fate of a pending battle by single combat, if the army of Israel could furnish a champion to meet him But Saul and his men were afraid; nor did any one possess the courage to accept the challenge. David was then a ruddy youth, whom his father sent to the camp to bear his favor of his sons, who were in the army. When he saw Goliath vaporing in his vanity, and heard him defying the army of Israel; and when, to his mortification, he saw his own brethren, and the whole host of his people shrinking with fear at the profane boasting of the uncircumcised champion.

he felt emotions which we can more readily conceive than describe. He was not a moment in deciding, in his mind, that Goliath's challenge ought to be accepted. This was no sooner known by Saul than he made inquiry, and found the youth ready to meet in single combat this champion who was the terror of Saul and all his men of war. Saul feared for the safety of David, and expostulated with him. He reminded him of his youth, and that he was going to meet a foe who had been a man of war from his youth.—But David informed Saul that he had slain a lion and a bear, which attempted to rob his father's flock of a lamb, and that he was confident that God would make that uncircumcised Philistine as one of them. Such was Saul's concern for David, that he put his own armour on him, and furnished him with all the defence possible.—But David refused all these, and taking his staff and sling, choose five smooth stones out of the brook, with which he fearlessly met and overcame this fearful champion. This David was a Benjaminite, and well skilled in the use of the sling; and with this weapon he prevailed. Now what we desire to have considered here is the perfect innocence of David, in this interesting combat. Saul, the king, was concerned for nothing, as it appears, but for the safety of this beautiful youth. He felt no apprehensions that any prejudice to himself could result from David's success in this case. No doubt the sincere desire of his heart was gratified when he saw the champion fall. But when Saul and his victorious army returned in triumph, and the women came out of the cities to meet the king, singing and dancing, and exclaiming, Saul has slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands, those elements which compose the demon of envy, were immediately called together, and kindled into a fury of horrid mien.

Let us now look at this whole affair ; and let candor judge and decide whether David, by the help of God, in whom he trusted, was not the innocent cause of Saul's deadly envy. It really seems that the subject is too plain to either need argument, or admit of doubt. But, says the hearer ; though this must be allowed, the question arises, wherein does the criminality of Saul's envy consist, if it were the effect of that which was innocent and good ? The answer is ready. Saul's criminality consisted in his designing evil ; and it was this evil design which led him to all the acts of injustice and cruelty which he committed against David and others, on his account. But another question here presents its demands ; and it is one too of high consideration in relation to the general subject. Why does not this argument suppose the same criminality in the divine Being, who is allowed to be the cause of this criminal envy, as it attributes to Saul, in whose breast it burned ? To this weighty question the answer is also ready. It is because the argument contends that the design which the divine Being had in causing this envy in Saul was a good design. The whole was designed and overruled by our heavenly Father for good, and was wholly dictated by that heavenly wisdom which is full of mercy and good fruits, and which is without partiality. We will here allow the objector to urge what to him may seem to be of weight, that as the argument allows that the divine Being intended and caused all the evil which actually took place, by the agency of Saul, if we argue that the Divine Being is innocent in this case, we should also allow the innocency of Saul. But to this we reply : there is a very plain difference in the moral character which the argument attributes to the Creator and to the creature. All the evil which actually took place was designed by the Creator for the good of all concerned ; but in the design of the creature there was not the smallest particle of divine benevolence or good will ; and it is the difference in the moral nature of those opposite designs, which constitutes the moral difference in the characters of the Creator and the creature. If it could be seen that Saul, in all his conduct which we have noticed, was actuated by a purely benevolent disposition, designing the whole for the ultimate good of all whom his acts concerned, and seeing at the same time how this good would be brought about by such means, we should see no cause why his entire innocence should not be allowed. But not being able to find this good design in Saul, nor the least shadow of evidence of its existence, we are compelled to ascribe to him the character of cruel, relentless envy.

The hearer is now, unquestionably, prepared to see that it is absolutely necessary to leave out of our creed the doctrine of infinite evil, or unlimited suffering, as it is impossible for such evil or suffering to be overruled for the good of those who endure it. As our argument contends that God is the innocent cause of the sin which men commit, and maintains this hypothesis on the ground that he designs all this sin and its consequent guilt, condemnation and suffering, for the ultimate good of all, we see that the admission of endless suffering would destroy every vestige of this system of reasoning, as it is not possible to conceive how suffering, which will never end, can result in the benefit of the sufferer. Sound reasoning, on this subject, will moreover show, that as the designing of evil, without intending it for good, constitutes the sinful or criminal cause, by allowing that the divine Being ever was the cause of that which he did not design for ultimate good, we charge him with criminality !

The instructions of the blessed Savior will assist us in illustrating the principle that the cause of moral evil may be innocent. The following are his words :—Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth ! I tell you nay ; but rather division : for from henceforth there shall be five in one house divided, three against two and two against three. The father shall be divided against the son, and the son against the father ; the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother ; the mother-in-law against the daughter-in-law, and the daughter-in-law- against the mother-in-law ; and a man's foes shall be those of his own household." In this passage the Savior acknowledges that he came to effect division in families ; to make fathers and sons foes to each other, and to set at variance mothers and daughters. But we cannot suppose that he meant to accuse himself of being the criminal cause of those deadly feuds and family quarrels ; nor can it be allowed, by any who know his spirit and doctrine, and who love the same, that he was the criminal cause of such unhappy divisions. We find the criminal cause of all such wickedness in the superstition and bigotry of the religious people of those times, in which the gospel was planted in our world. The doctrine of Jesus was as pure as the light of heaven ; its favor was as free as the descending rain; it fell on the multitude like the gentle dew on the grass of the field ; the common people heard him gladly, and wondered at the gracious words which he uttered ; but the bigoted priests, scribes and pharisees, who had made the law of God void by their traditions, found that the doctrine of Jesus, with all its precepts, would sweep away the whole system of their religion, if it should prevail. They were stung with jealousy, and fired with deadly envy against the blessed Son of God, as was king Saul against David. Hence proceeded that spirit of hostility against the doctrine and religion of Jesus, which was the criminal cause of those unhappy divisions among the people, and which introduced into families the bane of discord and deadly hate.

Here it is necessary to mark the difference between the innocent and the criminal cause.—Divine wisdom saw that all this enmity and opposition to the Gospel were necessary for the fulfillment of the declarations of the prophets concerning the Messiah, that all things might be fulfilled that were written concerning him. The same divine wisdom designed all this opposition and persecution, which were carried on with such vehemence, for the purpose of promoting the cause of truth, which in its final effects would overcome and subdue the false religion which caused the scribes and pharisees to oppose it. This foreknowledge of God and his benevolent design in all this vast concern, show most clearly that he was the innocent cause of the whole. But on the part of the active agents who opposed and persecuted the gospel and those who promulgated it, we find no benevolent, no gracious design or purpose ; but the most heated jealousy and inflamed envy which ever burned in the breast of the wicked. This spirit, and design to oppose and overthrow the truth, prove, as clearly as any thing can be proved, that criminality was found in the enemies of Christ. If, on due examination, we were able to discover that the chief priests, the scribes and pharisees, together with all who opposed Christ and his doctrine, understood that their exertions were necessary for the promotion of this doctrine, and that they designed it for that purpose, it would prove that they were the friends of Christ and his religion, and would establish their innocency beyond all dispute. But their evil design proves that they were the criminal cause of the miseries which their opposition to the religion of Jesus produced ; but the gracious design of our heavenly Father, in relation to all this enmity, and the acknowledged fact that he overruled the whole for the good of all concerned, prove that he was the innocent cause of all these events.

Another case, recorded in Scripture, which presents our general subject in a light most convincing, is that of the envy and enmity os the brethren of Joseph towards him. A careful examination of the circumstances which produced the envy will quickly arrive at an understanding of their innocency. God, in his gracious wisdom inspired Joseph with dreams which he in all the simplicity and innocency of childhood, related in the family circle. The dreams were easily and quickly understood by his brethren to indicate the future exaltation of Joseph, and the humble dependence of his brethren, and their submission to his authority. For these dreams his brethren hated him ; and the fire of their envy burned with such vehemence as to overpower the sweet sympathies of kindred affections, and to effect in their minds the murderous design of destroying their brother. If wickedness ever presented dyes of an apdalling cast, we find those colors in the deception which those brethren practised on their venerable father, when they presented him with the bloody coat of his son, of his beloved Joseph. How hard must have been their hearts not to relent when they saw the anguish of their father, and heard his exclamation, "It is my son's coat; an evil beast hath devoured him ; Joseph is without doubt rent in pieces,—I will go down into the grave unto my son mourning." Only go one step back of the envy which was kindled in the breasts of those unhappy brethren, and all is peaceful innocency. God was the innocent cause of this envy by inspiring Joseph with such dreams. Joseph was an innocent cause of the same envy by relating his dream to the family. This envy was the criminal cause of that conduct which effectually destroyed the felicity of the sacred family circle, drowned the holy patriarch in sorrow's dark waters, and engulphed the wicked perpetrators of this outrage in guilt and condemnation.

As the cause which produced the wickedness which was practiced, by the brethren of Joseph against him, was innocent, and as the whole of this wickedness was overruled, by divine wis-

dom and goodness, unto a benevolent end, it seems to furnish incontestible proof of the principle for which we have contended in this discourse. But in order to see how this general argument fully and effectually does away the doctrine of endless punishment for sin, and thereby removes the great and weighty objection, which lies in the mind of the professed Arminian, against the doctrine of predestination, and against allowing that God is the cause of all events, it is necessary to show that sin is designed by our heavenly Father, not only for good, on some broad and general principle, but it is necessary to show that it is designed and overruled for the good of those who are its criminal agents. A most clear and convincing manifestation of this infinitely important fact we have in the case of Joseph's brethren, to which we have in part attended. It is seen that in consequence of their envy and hatred, they sold their brother to merchants, who again sold him for a slave in Egypt; and it is also very evident that in consequence of his becoming a servant in the house of Potiphar he became the subject of the persecution of his wicked mistress, who caused him to be cast into prison; and it is also evident that his being thus confined was the cause of his acquaintance with the chief baker and chief butler, whose dreams he intepreted, which was the cause of his being brought before Pharaoh to interpret his dreams, which none of the wise men of Egypt could possibly solve. This astonishing instance of the wisdom of Joseph was the cause of his advancement to authority and power next to the throne, which proved an incalculable blessing to all Egypt and the whole surrounding country, by seasonably laying up in store sufficient corn to sustain the inhabitants of the land during seven years of famine. Thus we see that the envy and wickedness of Joseph's brethren, bitter as gall and wormwood as they flowed in a perturbed, deadly stream at first, carried immense blessings into Egypt and the adjoining country. But were those envious, wicked brethren excluded from the favors which resulted to thousands of others? No: we see them coming into Egypt to buy corn for their wanting families; they bow to Joseph before they know him, and obtain a supply of the staff of life at his hands without knowing that it was he whom they hated and sold, who thus opened his hand to their relief. But when he made himself known to his brethren, with what tenderness and affection did he address them, saying: "I am Joseph, your brother, whom ye sold into Egypt. Now, therefore, be not grieved nor angry with yourselves that ye sold me hither; for God did send me before you to preserve life." And moreover, even after the death of their father, when these brethren feared what Joseph might do to them for their trespass against him, and came and fell down before him and craved his forgiveness, he kindly replied, "Fear not—ye thought evil against me; but God meant it unto good, to bring to pass, as it is this day, to save much people alive—fear not; I will nourish you and your little ones." In this reply, Joseph sets up the doctrine which we are endeavoring to exemplify. "*Ye thought evil against me, but God meant it unto good.*" What did God mean unto good? Answer—the very evil which they thought against Joseph. What good did God intend by that evil which those brethren intended? Answer, that of saving many thousands of lives, and the lives of those brethren with the rest. The whole family of promise was preserved from famine by the consequences resulting from that envy which moved those brethren to sell Joseph.

If our heavenly Father has given us to understand, and to know, that it is consistent with his moral perfections to design and overrule the evil of sin, in any instance, for general good, and even for the good of those who are criminal agents in it; it is by no means necessary that we should be able to discern the good which he designs by every instance of moral evil, in order to justify us in believing that he does design and overrule all sin in the same gracious manner.—He, in compassion to us his weak and erring children, has given us abundant evidence of that blessed truth, that "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." In this doctrine we may find rest to our souls, and infinite reason to be thankful to God, and humbly joyful in his presence.

We feel unwilling to leave this subject, until we notice a very popular objection which its opposers urge against it. They say, if this doctrine be allowed, we may do evil that good may come. After this same manner did the enemies of the apostles slander them, reporting that they said; "Let us do evil that good may come."

In replying to this unwise objection, we will ask the opposer to make the trial, that he may convince himself. What has he got to do? He is to do evil that good may come. Then his design in what he does must be that good may come. But this very design constitutes his act morally good; for the moral character ot every act is determined by the design of the actor. If Joseph's brethren had seen into futurity, and with a clear understanding had comprehended the necessity of Joseph's going into Egypt, and had sold him for the purpose of bringing his dreams to pass, in compliance with the wisdom and design of God, there certainly would have been no enmity in their hearts towards their brother, nor moral evil in what they did. And their is another thing which the objector ought to know, and that is, that if Joseph's brethren had fully believed that God would overrule their envy and wickedness towards their brother, for his future exaltation, and their own benefit, it would have entirely overcome their envy and washed away the whole of their sin.

That the sentiment which we have endeavored to support in this discourse, may be fully believed and realized; and that it may have and exert a happy moral influence on our hearts and lives, may God in mercy add his blessing.

A new Universalist church was dedicated at Covington, N. Y. on Sunday 6th inst. One at Perry, N. Y. on Monday 7th inst. and one at East-Bloomfield, N. Y. on Sunday 13th inst. The Sermons all by Br. D. Skinner, of the Magazine and Advocate.

The new Meeting house erected the past season at Harford, (Virgil Flats,) by the Universslists, Presbyterians and Methodists was to be dedicated on the 21st inst. Sermon by Br. J. Chase.

Original.

REPLY TO Z. G.

DEAR SIR—If I understand you correctly, you have no more faith in *ghosts* than myself. "*The real substance of a deceased person,*" you think, never appears to the living. Still you contend, "*the likeness*" or "*the apparitions of persons have appeared.*" The common idea is, that a ghost and apparition are the same. But if you make a distinction between them, and admit an apparition is not the soul of a deceased person, you admit all I contend about. In your view of apparitions, you "include all supernatural sights, noises," etc. But how are they known to be supernatural? I have not been able to learn that they are so from the bible; I have had no supernatural sights myself; and no man has ever proved to me that he has had any. I admit men of sound mind say, they have "had as clear an impression of seeing a man when no man was there, as they ever had when a man was really there." I do not dispute their veracity, the soundness of their understandings, or the strength of their impressions about this; nor shall I say, it "arose from any deceptive object." We have read of several cases of this kind, but it was found the deception arose from disease of body, particularly the eyes, and not from any deceptive object looked at. We have also read and heard of similar cases arising from the imagination, &c. An old lady once requested me to be one of nine ministers, to come to her house to dismiss a ghost, which she supposed we could do by our prayers. She was troubled with the sight of a person in her room almost every evening. After conversing with her I convinced her that the ghost was her own shadow on the walls of her room. I also once heard a man declare with tears, that his deceased father and mother both made their appearance to him at once, and exhorted him to abandon his dissipated courses. But so long as I knew him he still continued in them. I have no idea the man told what he knew to be false; nor have I any faith in the fact of his father and mother appearing to him. I rather think he was deceived, and his conscience, his imagination, and perhaps his intoxication, contributed in making him suppose he saw them. God has given men his word, and the case of this man shews, if men believe not Moses and the prophets, neither will they believe if one rise from the dead.

I admit, it is equally the mark of a weak mind to resist sufficient evidence, as to believe without sufficient evidence. But am I to believe in apparitions without evidence? A man tells me that he saw something he calls an apparition, and he nor no other person can account for the sight. But must I conclude it is supernatural? I think not. For where are we to stop in believing? Every thing for which we cannot rationally account becomes supernatural on this principle, and by it we are carried back to the dark ages. It was by adopting this principle, that things for which men could not account must be supernatural, that the multiplicity of superstitions were introduced. Men of great minds sanctioning these things, is no proof of their truth; for great men have sometimes great weakness about them. You say justly, that "mankind are compounded of strange materials." It was no mark of the strength of Napoleon's mind, that he would not undertake any important business on a Friday—a common weakness of sailors who dislike going to sea on Friday. And why Madam Roland and your deist should be favored with forewarnings of their relation's death, and others denied it, would require something of a supernatural kind to account for it.

You say, 'miracles which were designed to convince the world at large, such as are revealed in the Bible, have ceased. Miracles which are designed for the conviction of individuals will never cease.' I am sorry to see this remark. Public miracles had ceased, and ceased before one in a million of the world were convinced. Private miracles will never cease, and not one in a million are favored with them. But I must ask, what are your private miracles designed to convince individuals of? Is it of any new revelation from God? If it is, why are not all favored with them? If it is not, of what use are they? But do you call what you say about Napoleon, Madam Roland, and the deist, private miracles? If so, these kind of miracles are becoming less common now, and in all probability may cease also. Indeed, during the dark ages, your private miracles abounded. But I beseech you to consider, whether these private miracles are not calculated to lead men away from the belief of God's word, and to despise public miracles which have ceased. I have never enjoyed any of your private miracles to convince me of any thing. I have no authority from God's word to expect them, nor do I wish them, for I doubt if they would either add to my conviction or comfort.

I would gladly notice some other things in your letter, but my time at present does not permit. Nor is it necessary, for if *apparitions* are not disembodied spirits,as you admit,your views do not affect the views advanced in my Essays. If any persons have seen *apparitions*, or have had private miracles, let them enjoy the pleasure if it affords any. Until I have had private miracles for my conviction, it is not to be expected I should believe in them. If any man hath a dream, let him tell his dream, and let others believe it who please. As for myself, I seldom dream more than once in a year, and still more seldom dream any thing worth telling. I have neither been dreamed nor frightened into religion, but convinced of its truth in a more excellent way. Your's W. BALFOUR.

Original.

A FRAGMENT.

* * * * * * * * "Nay, raise the curtain, Flora, and let me look out once more upon the night. I fain would gaze again upon the beaming stars that twinkle there so brightly, like gems hung round a diadem ——— there ——— so.". * * * * The speaker was a youth of some five and twenty years, and apparently his career was rapidly drawing to a close, and the one to whom the foregoing request was directed, his sister, some years his senior.—With the alacrity of one whose every wish seemed centered in one beloved object,she performed the trifling request, and turned round the easy in which the enfeebled invalid was seated, that he might the better contemplate the scene before him. I have said he was young—but the deep worn lines that were gathered on his broad and noble brow, would seem to donote a more advanced voyage on the ocean of time. His face was singularly beautiful, and of that peculiar mould in which deep thought is blended with the high and enthusiastic feelings of the young; while the lip curved almost to the curl of pride and scorn, would seem to impart to an observer the idea of their being the principal ingredients in the character of the individual, had not the meekness that beamed from his eyes, convinced him that, whatever might have been that character under different circumstances, christian humility was now predominant.

He was a high soul'd romautic youth, and possessed talents of the finest order, which had been improved by an excellent education ; rather seriously inclined, perhaps from constitutional debility, and the effects of a fatal disease under which he was then laboring. He had early devoted his time and attention to studies of a devotional character ; he had examined attentively each system of popular theology, had weighed each in the balance of reason, and found them wanting. In vain he turned to the world, observed the practice of the vain-glorious professors of religion—'twas all a shallow mockery—hypocrisy, cant, deception. Disgust usurped the better feelings of his nature ; he loathed his kind ; hated, despised his fellow-men. Eagerly had he perused the pages of Voltaire, Volney and Mirabeau. Their oily poisons had sunk deep into his soul ; scepticism triumphed ! he was an infidel. The unhallowed sentiment had passed his lips—"there is no God" ! Still was he unhappy. Doubts would arise in his mind, in defiance of his favorite authors. And finally, reckless of the future, he had settled down into the most stoical indifference. * * *

There was but one being, of all the world the only one he loved, whose opinions he respected; for she was "all in all" to him—tender, faithful and affectionate, and she was a UNIVERSALIST. She had tried to persuade him of the truths of the principles. Angel-like, she had pleaded for the adoption of the doctrine of love ; enforced her plea with arguments strong, rational, and persuasive—and in the silent hours of the night, when no eye but her maker's was upon her, she had prayed that his heart might be awakened to a knowledge of the truth. Her prayers had been answered ; her fervent wishes crowned with success. Light dawned upon the benighted mind of her brother ; the murky mists of infidelty vanished before the refulgent blaze of truth and reason,and the sceptic now stood out in the broad and cheering light of the "faith once delivered to the saints." * * * *

It was one of those beautiful evenings in summer, which poets love to paint ; calm, cloudless and serene. The moon was but just rising, and had cast her mellowed rays upon the hill-tops, and the bright stars had came one by one into their accustomed stations. The flowers had drawn themselves within their leafy bells, and the birds had hid their little heads beneath their wings, and their songs were no more heard upon the gale. It seemed as though natue's self was bowing down in fervent adoration before the altar of its great Author. All was so calm, so silent, even as the half heard breathing of an infant at its mother's breast ! He gazed long and attentively upon the heavenly scene ; his eyes were lit up with a holy enthusiasm, and a shade of deep, unutterable thought stole over his fine and expressive features. ——— "Oh, how beautiful they look to-night !" said he, musing —"like the pure spirits of the blest, shining free and unapproachable, above the frail atoms of mortality of this nether world ! I love to look upon the stars, the bright the glowing stars, and the meek and quiet moon, so pale and silent in her queen-like majesty ; fit emblems, Flora, of the Deity thou has taught me to love ! They never change or falter in their course. Their ceaseless round is still the same ! The proud and haughty monuments of man,crumble away beneath the never tiring wings of all-searing time ! Powers and worlds have faded and become as naught ! And man,too, the most noble work of God, has descended to his native dust. The mind that would pry into the hidden mysteties of nature—genius, eloquence that would enchain, entrance the multitude, are swept away ! all, all die, and are forgotten ! Even the noblest works of art, that send their proud, aspiring heads away above the paths of men, looking as though they would perpetuate his memory to the remotest period of existence—they perish, too, and are remembered no more ! But the stars, Flora, they shine on—still pursue their silent course above us ! not one goes out ! days, months, years, ages roll away, to swell the countless myriads on the shores of eternity, and still the same bright orbs look down in beauty on the earth—each one an everlasting monument to the glory of the one living & true God !" He paused for a moment and then resumed in a feeble tone—"Now, dearest sister,sing me that pretty hymn I've listened to so often with renewed delight ; my heart will attune to its numbers with holiest fervency"—and the gentle girl, in a voice of the sweetest melody, sang the following lines :

O, give me the fleet wings of a dove,
Let me mount on its pinions afar,
Let me fly to the blest mansions of love,
Where the bright and the beautiful are—
O, welcome the glad moment when earth
Shall receive its frail tenant of clay,
And the soul of an immortal birth,
Shall away to its Maker, away,
To its Maker shall hasten away !

In His presence there's joy and delight,
Which the ills of a world cannot dim,
And angels all lovely and bright,
Round His throne their sweet praises shall hymn!
O, then let me but join the blest throng,
Let me join in the heavenly lay,
And my lips shall attune to their song,
O! then haste thee, my spirit, away,
To thy home in the skies then, away !

O, why dost thou linger, my soul,
Flee away to the mansions above,
Thou'lt find rest when thou reachest the goal,
Beneath the broad wings of his love !
For He is the great parent of all !
On the humble, the reckless, the gay
His bland smiles of benevolence fall.
To the Parent of all, then, away !
Trembling soul ! to thy Parent away !

She ceased, but no murmur of applause, the usual tribute to her efforts, passed from the lips of the invalid. All was silent as the grave, and when she looked up into her brother's face—he was dead ! With the last notes of that hymn the threads of life, that had been worn so fine, were gently broken. There had been no struggle in the death ; the face was calm and serene as a summer day's close, and the meek spirit, as it departed from its tabernacle of flesh had left a smile upon the lips, so bright and beautiful, that he seemed but sleeping—death to him had been so gentle ! * * * * One burst of affectionate sorrow, and the Universalist girl is kneeling by the lifeless body of her brother, in prayer to her God—"he is with thee, merciful Father, and to thee be all honor and glory forever !" J. P.

Philadelphia, Nov. 6, 1833.

MY MOTHER.

If there is a being on earth that deserves my respect, my esteem, my warmest love, it is my mother. I reflect with the highest degree of satisfaction on my past life, I feel conscious that I have been guilty of no neglect of duty, of inattention or unkindness towards her who first gave me birth, and then with the tenderest and most watchful care,guarded and guided me safely through the alluring paths and labyrinths of youthful life. A mother's whole soul is turned to the welfare of her children. For them she passes many a sleepless night, awaiting their return from their various pastimes and recreations, or wathing over them while languishing in sickness ; for them she rises at the dawn, and endures the fatigues of the day without a murmur ; for them she often is elated with the most joyful sensations, and anon for them she sinks in sorrow and gloomy care ! For them only she seems to live and move, and with a most tenacious grasp,to hold and hang upon life's slender thread, and for them she is ready to depart and be no more on earth.

When I look upon my affectionate mother, now advanced in life, I seem to wish that we might be specially favored by heaven, and placed back in life about thirty years, that I might have an opportunity of doing her more positive good ; that I might render to her services of more essential benefit, and different from what she now may require, although, as I before said, I have no scruples of conscience about the former observance of my filial duties. But stay ! are there now no opportunities to serve one to whom I owe every thing of kindness and tender regard ? If she expresses a wish,shall I hesitate to gratify her, thinking it to be the "effect of humor at old age ?" It is a "delightful task to rear the tender thought," to conduct the youth from infancy up to manhood ? And is there no pleasure in extending a helping hand to aid and succour those who are passing down the declivity of life ? Yes, my mother, it shall ever be the highest satisfaction of him whom thou 'hast nourished and brought up,' for whose safety thou hast labored and toiled, and whose growth and improvement thou hast watched with the warmest interest and affection, to look to thee in nature's decline ; to anticipate each want and wish ; to strew down in the rugged pathway ; to bring comfort, joy and peace, that thy decline of life may afford thee, so far as possible on earth, a happy and cheering foretaste of Heaven.—*Amaranth.*

MESSENGER& UNIVERSALIST.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1832.

INFLUENCE OF REVIVALS.

We have long believed that revivals of religion, so called, were possessed of no very happy moral influence. They foster excitement rather than the genuine spirit of Christianity. They furnish us too few examples of retiring, unostentatious devotion to the humble duties which religion requires. They have a tendency to make religious feeling and christian virtue rather periodical than permanent. The great principles of moral action which Christ enjoined, and which he designed to be felt and constantly influential in the heart, become temporary and evanescent. There is too much religion generally in the world that should be called *Sunday* religion, which promises immunity to its votaries for the whole week on condition that they will wear sad and disfigured faces on the first day—a religion, like a fine coat, which is put on when the labors of the week have ended, and put off again with equal ease when they are resumed.

The following observations are extracted from "Flint's Travels and Residence in Mississippi."—Mr. Flint was a Congregationalist or Presbyterian clergyman, and therefore cannot be suspected of any undue prejudices against that kind of religion which is becoming more and more fashionable amongst his sect. In his 20th Letter under the head of New-Madrid, he says,

"One general trait appears to me strongly to characterize this region in a religious point of view. They are anxious to collect a great many people and preachers, and achieve, if the expression may be allowed, a great deal of religion at once, that they may lie by, and be exempt from its rules and duties until the recurrence of the period of replenishing the exhausted stock. Hence we witness the melancholy aspect of much appearance and seeming, frequent meetings, spasms, cries, fallings, faintings, and, what I imagine will be a new aspect of religious feeling to most of my readers, the religious laugh. Nothing is more common at these scenes, than to see the more forward people on these occasions indulging in what seemed to me an idiot and spasmodic laugh, and when I asked what it meant, I was told that it was the holy laugh! Preposterous as the term may seem to my readers, the phrase 'holy laugh' is so familiar to me, as no longer to excite surprise. But in the same region, and among the same people, morals, genuine tenderness of heart, and capacity to be guided either by reason, persuasion, or the uniform dictates of the gospel, was an affecting desideratum."

Such is the testimony of Mr. Flint. With the exception of the "holy laugh," we are accustomed in some degree to all the other accompaniments of the Mississippi religion. And we are of opinion that here as well as there, those who have the most "appearance and seeming" are not always nor generally possessed of the best "morals," nor discover themselves most ready "to be guided by either reason, persuasion, or the uniform dictates of the gospel." S.

SUICIDES.

Almost every paper we open contains some account of a suicide, committed in various manners, and under various circumstances, all sufficiently appalling and distressing, awakening a spirit of inquiry as to the causes which lead to so many untimely ends. In England it was supposed that gloomy weather made impressions on weak and nervous minds, which led to suicides. Actual want and miserable prospects—the severity of labor, and the trifling pittance of industry—the high price of food—the taxes—the high price to obtain justice, and a thousand local causes, may have contributed to the vast number of suicides committed in that country. In the United States, where the number of suicides equal those of England, we have no actual want for a person of ordinary industry; provisions are cheap and plentiful; the climate is lively and healthy; we have no taxes, no tithes, no wars, no insurrections, nothing of a moral or political character which can depress the spirits, create gloomy and "thick coming fancies," and induce people to lay violent hands on themselves. Drunkenness, and all its train of misery, too frequently leads to suicide; and yet there are more sober persons make away with themselves than drunkards. A bad husband or a bad wife, or bad children, or any domestic calamity, may be suffered to prey on the spirits, until it leads to this awful exit; still, a little reflection should convince the distressed object, that however miserable he may deem himself to be, there are others in the world infinitely more so; and when he imagines that all is lost for him, all hope, expectation, comfort, consolation, and happiness on this earth are gone forever—that is the very crisis to look for consolation and better days from him who alone can give them. With all the religion and the show of religion in this country, we place less confidence and reliance on divine mercy and providential succor than any people on earth. We place less reliance also on our own energies and strength of mind to discover and remove causes of calamity and misfortune. We bend to fate like reeds before the tempest, and rush into eternity because we have not the courage to face trouble. Many of the suicides of our country arise from an excess of religious zeal, which leads to fanaticism, to insanity, and death. There is a gloom which is carefully cast round the bright and inspiring halo of religion, like clouds obscuring the sweet and silver surface of the moon, casting endless shadows on our path. Some men delight to look at religion through dark and dismal channels, through clouds and tempests, through eternal fires, tortures, and punishments—until melancholy forebodings, doubts, darkness, and difficulties prey on the mind—shut out hope, and lead to a premature grave. When religion and cheerfulness shall go hand in hand—when we look to God for love and mercy, and not vengeance and death, we shall establish the triumph of religion, and fanaticism and suicide will be from religious causes unknown.

We find the foregoing remarks on Suicides in the "Evening Star," a new daily paper commenced in this city by Messrs. Noah & Gill. They contain so much sound sense and truth, that we cannot forego the opportunity of presenting them to our readers. The subject of them, too, is of vast moment. Suicides have increased within the past few years to such an alarming degree that we may well inquire "as to the causes which have lead to such untimely ends." And need we prosecute these inquiries far, to satisfactorily account for a large proportion of them? We think not. Follow the devasting track of Modern Revivals, and the attentive observer cannot long be in doubt on the subject. Despair, insanity and death present their hideous forms on almost every hand. The amount of evil, we joyfully admit, is lessening; but there are no thanks due the actors in these scenes, for their agency therein; for they strain every nerve apparently for the same disastrous results as formerly; but we are rather indebted to a wise providence and to the unalterable laws of nature for our deliverance in part from the appaling effects. The excitement has been driven to so great a pitch, that we have every reason to believe a re-action is now taking place; and we think there is abundant evidence that a wise and benignant being is overruling those very means, adopted in human weakness for the *advancement* of modern revivals, for their eventual *overthrow*, and the more effectual promotion of pure and undefiled religion. Thousands who before had glided smoothly down the popular current, unthinking and unconcerned—who could sit week after week, and year after year under the *moderate* preaching of endless wrath and damnation, without the movement of a single muscle, or experiencing one throb of pity or anxiety on the subject, are aroused to deep, active reflection, when the legitimate consequences of those doctrines, *thoroughly preached* and *fully believed*, are placed before them in all their awful reality of despair, insanity and death.

The Press, too, will occasionally speak out in behalf of suffering humanity, as in the extract above, of which instances we are ever happy to make mention. We commend the closing remarks of the article to serious consideration. How true the remark, that "some delight to look at religion through dark and dismal channels." And equally true is the observation, that "when religion and cheerfulness shall go hand in hand"—when we look to a God of "*love* and *mercy*" instead of a God of "*vengeance* and *death*, we shall establish the triumph of religion."—We wish the Press, "that modern Boreas," would carry on its resistless blast, these joyful truths, until they reach every doubting heart, and the "triumph" of genuine religion be complete. P.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

The following extract is from a sermon preached by the Rev. Hosea Ballou, of Boston, entitled "God the author of all things," Text 1 Sam. xxii, 22.

I consider the doctrine to be *abombinable*; and in substance the same as that professed by the Jesuits, which has been so long held in detestation by the moralist, viz. "*The end sanctifies the means.*"

Your opinion is requested at large on the sentiments, as to their morality, agreement with the scriptures, accordance with your view of the character of the Deity, the effect they would have on mankind if generally believed and practised, &c.

After contending that "God is the cause of the sin which men commit," the reverend author continues:

"We feel unwilling to leave this subject, till we notice a very popular objection which its opposers urge against it. They say, if this doctrine be allowed, we may do evil that good may come.

In replying to this unwise objection, we will ask the opposer to make the trial, that he may convince himself. What has he got to do? He is to do *evil* that *good* may come. Then his *design* in what he does, must be that good may come. But this very *design* constitutes his *act* morally good; *for the moral character of every act is determined by the design of the actor.*"

ASPASIO.

REMARKS.

On our first page will be found the sermon from which our correspondent has made his extract. We give it to our readers that they may judge of its merits or demerits. Besides, when a paragraph is taken from its connexion, it often bears a very different aspect from what it actually presents. More than this, our correspondent has, we think, done Mr. Ballou some injustice by two or three omissions. For instance, Aspasio says, "After contending that, 'God is the cause of the sin which men commit,' the reverend author continues," &c. Mr. Ballou says, "As our argument contends that God is the *innocent* cause of the sin which men commit," &c. By omitting the word 'innocent,' our correspondent, we think, has misrepresented Mr. Ballou, who seems most cautiously to have guarded against every

thing that could imply criminality in God, or detract from the divine character. At least he intended to do this. Again, Aspasio quotes Mr. Ballou thus, "We feel unwilling to leave this subject till we notice a very popular objection which its opposers urge against it. They say, if this doctrine be allowed, we may do evil that good may come." Here ends our correspondent. Mr. Ballou immediately adds, "After this same manner did the enemies of the apostles slander them, reporting that they said, 'Let us do evil that good may come.'" This remark, in this connexion, should not, we think, have been omitted. For however Mr. Ballou may err in his opinions or reasonings on the subject, it shows that he believes the charge here brought, to be unfounded and slanderous, and the same that was brought against the apostles for preaching the same doctrine.

The sermon referred to, as will be seen by a careful perusal of it, was not designed to furnish rules of human conduct, but to account for phenomena, which we behold in the moral world. And that part of it which our correspondent has quoted, may be regarded as an incidental observation by no means necessary to the subject. The author had presented several illustrations of his doctrine drawn from the Scriptures, wherein the wickedness of man was confessedly instrumental in effecting the most benevolent and happy results. In these cases, such as that of Joseph's brethren, and the murderers of Christ for instance, Mr. Ballou recognized both the wisdom and goodness of God. He believed that the wickedness of Joseph's brethren entered into and formed a part of the divine plan, in fine that they were the criminal agents, in promoting a good object, and God "the innocent cause" of the sin of which they were guilty. By this and other similar examples he thought the hypothesis established, that God works all things together for good, so that the language of Joseph to his brethren might be applied to every sinner in the world. "*As for you, ye thought evil, but God meant it for good.*"

Such we understand to be Mr. Ballou's views on the subject, and here his discourse might have ended. But there was a popular objection to which he wished to reply. The opposer was introduced virtually saying, "If such is the doctrine, let us do evil that good may come. If God overruled the sin of Joseph's brethren, of Christ's murderers, so as to make their wickedness subservient to the best of purposes,—if this is a principle in his government,—if, in fine, where sin abounds, grace does much more abound,—surely the greater evil, the greater good. The more we sin, the more happiness will God educe from it. Let us do evil, that good may come." Such is the objection. Mr. Ballou says,

"In replying to this unwise objection, we will ask the opposer to make the trial, that he may convince himself," &c. To save repetition the reader is referred to the last paragraph but one in the sermon. If there is any fallacy in this argument it is found in the assumed principle that "*the moral character of every act is determined by the design of the actor.*" This expression, we may remark is ambiguous. It may mean, either that the intention of an individual in any act determines his moral character in that act, or that it determines the character of the act itself. Aspasio, if we mistake not, understands it in the latter sense, which is not Mr. Ballou's meaning, and is utterly untrue. The intention of the actor does not change the character of his act. The actor may mean *well*, and yet his act be a *bad* one,—bad, as followed by evil consequences, or what is much the same thing, as opposed to the requirements, or prohibitions of the divine law. The last meaning being inadmissible, the question arises, is the former true? That is, is the moral character of the actor determined by his design in the action? In reply to this question, we may remark, that it is generally acknowledged, that he is not criminal who believes himself to be doing his duty. He may err, but he is not guilty in the ordinary acceptation of that term: for guilt implies the doing of a wrong act knowing it to be wrong at the time of its performance. But is this an infallible principle? Has it no exceptions? Our Savior spoke, John xvi, 2, in this manner, "The time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think he doeth God service." And Paul says, Acts xxvi, 9, "I verily thought with myself, that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth." Even after all his zeal in persecuting christians, the same Apostle, affirms, Acts xxiii, 1, that he had "lived in all good conscience before God until this day." But did this belief that they were doing God service in these persecutions, actually exculpate them from fault? Nay did it extenuate their guilt? It is quite evident that Paul acted *ignorantly in unbelief*, and probably others did the same. Indeed when Paul calls himself the chief of sinners, we are left to understand that he regarded himself as one of the most criminal. If these passages can be explained without involving the idea of guilt in those who thought they were doing God service, who acted with all good conscience before God, while persecuting the church of Christ, the principle assumed by Mr. Ballou, that the moral character of the actor is determined by his design, is, in our opinion altogether tenable. We are aware that "there is a way which seemeth right unto a man; but the end thereof is the way of death." A conviction of doing one's duty cannot change the nature, that is, the abstract character, or the consequences of his conduct. But how far such a conviction shall extenuate the guilt, or whether it shall entirely remove the criminality of his conduct, is a question of casuistry, which we do not at present attempt to decide. It seems to us, however, that a *consciousness* of guilt, is necessary in order to render an individual the proper subject of punishment.

We have probably said enough on the subject of Mr. Ballou's sermon. For the satisfaction of our correspondent we will now state our own views as clearly as we can.

We believe of necessity that God was before all beings, and that he is the author of all existences. We believe that he gave every power and faculty which man possesses. We should prefer applying the term *foreknowledge* rather than *foreordination*, to God in relation to the moral conduct of men. We believe that God made man in a certain manner free; yet infallibly foreknew every act which every human being would ever commit. This we think cannot be denied by any one. If God did not foreknow every thing, he must have had some things to learn, and perhaps could certainly have foreknown nothing. We here speak of human actions. Now being acquainted with all the liberty of man, with all his powers, with all the circumstances in which he would be placed, with all the temptations to which he would be exposed, with every influence internal and external, to which he would be subject, God infallibly foreknew every virtuous and every vicious act which mankind would ever perform. Thus foreknowing all the sins of which man would be guilty, God, in his infinite wisdom and goodness, made provision to meet and counteract them. The very sins which men commit he made an occasion for the display of his grace, so that "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." In short, we believe that he does and will overrule all evil and make it subservient to the greater good of his creatures, and the greater glory of himself, and that it was permitted to enter the moral system only on this condition. We feel it to be a conclusion as strong as demonstration could make it, that a good being would allow no evil, had he power to prevent it, which he did not purpose to counteract, and overrule for good. We do not, therefore, say that God is the author of sin in any proper sense of that term. He gave man his moral powers, and foreknew infallibly the use he would make of them, and the abuse which they would suffer, and he foreknew also that he himself would render even that abuse subservient to the most benevolent purposes. Man is the sinner, and hence the proper author of sin. God permits sin in his universe, but permits it only for a time, and will overrule its temporary existence to display his own goodness and to promote the happiness of man. S.

MARTYRDOM.

We have just been informed that one of our unfortunate, but unoffending papers, recently suffered martyrdom, in a regular committal to the flames, by a zealous but worthy Partialist lady in this city.—Her husband had directed an acquaintance to have the paper sent to him, and when the carrier called, the good woman received it, looked at the title—"Philadelphia Universalist!" says she—"here! take it! we are no Universalists here!" and in truth we must admit, that she at least was not one, for we verily believe she would have exhibited a different course of conduct, had such have been the case. The carrier declined taking it—his orders were to leave the paper—if there was any error in the case, notice must be given at the office. But the good woman had a more summary way of settling the business. ☞She resolutely committed the unholy thing to the flames! doubtless flattering herself at the time, that through her instrumentality there was so much the less heresy in the world.

The lady, we understand, is a professor. Does she remember the rebuke of our master to some of his disciples? "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of?" How much more in accordance with the mildness and forbearance of her sex—yea, in accordance with that religion she professed, would her conduct have been, had she have first examined what she was condemning so intemperately, and have reflected a little, and thereby saved herself from the ridiculous act of throwing into the fire an unoffending sheet of paper! But she was not altogether singular in this affair. It is the way of the world, and therefore she may plead example in extenuation of her conduct. By far too great a portion of mankind judge of things by the "title page," and estimate the amount of a man's religion, by his zeal in *professing* instead of *practicing*.

We have been told of several instances in which much feeling has been exhibited by females against the introduction of our paper into their houses.—Now we do not question the sincerity of our opposing sisters, but we do very much doubt the propriety of their proscriptive conduct, and we seriously recommend to them more calmness and self possession on a subject of this nature. They know nothing of the contents of the paper—they condemn it unheard. Look at it—examine its sentiments thoroughly. Be assured it will not hurt you; and beside, it is paying but a poor compliment to your understandings and decision of character, to be afraid, or above, the examination of opposing views. We know of many instances where there were strong feelings indulged against it, and now the same individuals have as strong an interest in its favor. We specially aim, in some of its departments, to study the feelings, interest and gratification of the female part of our readers. Portions of it are read, we believe with professed interest, by many opposed to us in sentiment. And we acknowledge, also, with gratitude, our obligations to females for many new subscribers on the present vol. (proba-

bly 20 to 30 new ones, at least, in this city.) Let us then, urge them all, who may chance to see this, how much soever they may be opposed, to judge us with candor before they condemn. P.

ELIAS HICKS.

This faithful servant of the Lord Jesus was much opposed to the practice of having likenesses taken. He considered it an evidence of vanity—and opposed to the humility that should be exercised by the christian disciple. At least I have thus understood his views. I remember having heard a little anecdote concerning this point. A certain painter was anxious to have an opportunity to take a likeness of him. Being apprehensive that a direct application would be refused, he sought counsel from an aged friend of Elias, in relation to the object he had in view. The advice received was as follows:—"I'll tell thee the likeliest way to get at it. Take thy pencil and paper, and take a seat in the meeting-house, where thee can have a full view of him. But take care that he does not see *thee*—for if he does, he will kick thee into the sea!"—meaning, simply, that Elias would severely rebuke any attempt of the kind. A. C. T.

THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION.

A public discussion took place at Danvers, Mass. on Wednesday 6th inst. between Rev. M. P. Braman, a Presbyterian minister of Danvers, and Br. Thomas Whittemore, editor of the Trumpet. The question for discussion was, "*Is the doctrine of endless misery revealed in the Holy Scriptures?*" A general notice of the discussion we find in the Trumpet. A full account of the arguments on both sides is promised soon, on which the public can judge as to the issue of it. From Br. Whittemore's account, we conclude he is satisfied with the result. Mr. M'Clure, author of the tirade of blackguardism, styled "Lectures on Universalism," to which we have alluded in former volumes, was one of the Moderators, but Br. Whittemore bears testimony that through this debate, his conduct "was strictly impartial and decorous." We are glad of this. It will serve as one redeeming trait in his character. It is a pity he could not be kept in such a situation; for his conduct is any thing but "impartial and decorous" when in the use of his pen against Universalism. P.

New Paper.

We have received the Prospectus for a new semi-monthly paper, to be published simultaneously in Boston, Mass. and Baltimore, Md. to be entitled "*The Ladies' Christian Advocate*," edited by S. F. Streeter, Boston; O. A. Skinner, Baltimore; Associate Editor, Samuel Wild, Washington. D. C. The editors say:

"Their wish is, to establish a publication devoted almost exclusively to the interests, the instruction and edification of female readers. It is intended that the tone of the work, both literary and religious shall be decisive, elevated and pure; that the censorship over all articles presented shall be strict and impartial, so that nothing be admitted into its columns which does not decidedly subserve the great interests of christian doctrine or tend to raise the standard of moral excellence and aid in developing the finer traits of the female character, the nobler powers of the female mind.

To this end, moral tales will be introduced in which particular and important principles will be illustrated and enforced; essays on the especial duties of woman, and on the various subjects connected with social and domestic intercourse; expositions on important doctrinal points, which may teach the truth and at the same time interpose a shield between the susceptible mind, and the influence of those dark doctrines which strike at the root of reason and sober judgment. The aid of poetic tales, and instructive anecdotes will also be called in that nothing may be wanting to a direct, full and permanent impression on the minds of daughters, sisters, wives, children and families."

The "Ladies, Christian Advocate" will be published every other Saturday, on fine white paper, royal size, at the low rate of $5 for six copies, or $1 in advance for single subscribers. The first No. will be issued on the first Saturday in Januury, 1834. Letters to be addressed (post paid) to "S. F. Streeter, Boston, Mass.," or to O. A. Skinner, Baltimore, Md." Those containing $2 or more, may be sent at the Proprietors expense, though nothing in such cases will be allowed for agency.

The publishers have our best wishes in their every effort to improve and interest the female portion of community. As we last week remarked in relation to the "Universalist," we have much to do here, and every laudable effort for the accomplishment of this purpose should be hailed with pleasure. We hope, therefore, that this new candidate for public favor, may prove a *christian* advocate, in truth and verity, and that it may also be abundantly successful in its labors. P.

"WORSE THAN THAT."

Br. Moore recently preached in a certain borough in the interior of Pennsylvania—having obtained the use of a convenient room in the basement story of the Episcopal church. This exercise of liberal feeling very much displeased a zealous Presbyterian brother. He waited on the Episcopalian Deacon, and warmly expressed his disapprobation of the measure—viz. allowing the use of the room to a *Universalist*. "We did worse than that a few weeks ago," said the Deacon. "How? in what way?" anxiously inquired the other. "We granted the use of it to a *Presbyterian*," was the Deacon's reply.

A. C. T.

MEETING OF ASSOCIATIONS.

The Cayuga Asssociation met at Genoa, N. Y. Sept. 25, 1823. Br. J, Chase, Moderator, and Br. W. Queal, Clerk. The new societies in Onondaga, Homer and Liverpool, were received into fellowship. Ordination was conferred on Br. G. Sanderson. Adjourned to meet in Virgil on the last Wednesday in Sept. 1834.

The Niagara Association met in Lockport, N. Y. on the 2d of Oct. Br. S. A. Skeele, Moderator, and Br. K. Townsend, Clerk. The Association was divided into three, one called the Niagara, one the Erie, and the other Chatauque Association. The Societies in North Murray, Clarkson, Almond, Independence, Pike and Newfane, were admitted into fellowship. Br. J. Lewis, K. Townsend and R. Tomlinson were ordained and Br. L. Paine, licensed. Adjourned to meet in Holly, Orleans Co. N. Y. first Wednesday in Oct. 1834.

Original.

UNIVERSALISM A LICENTIOUS DOCTRINE.

We can hardly cast our eye into any of the religious periodicals of the day without discovering some witty anecdote, or some well rounded period, intended to show that the doctrine of a world's salvation from sin and misery is a demoralizing sentiment. This doctrine, it is contended by its opposers, is the broad and pleasant road of sensual enjoyment, and thousands are smoothly gliding down its delusive current, till they shall be swallowed up in the immeasurable ocean of eternal wretchedness. The arch fiend of the sulphureous pit shouts aloud for joy while he beholds a doctrine spreading far and wide which he was so successful in proclaiming in "Eden's lovely bowers," and which is to secure him a large victory over many for whom the "Savior of the world" poured out his heart's blood.

But is it true that a belief in the final demolition of the devil and his works, and the final "restitution of all things," is calculated to sap the foundation of morality and to spread abroad havoc and ruin to all that is good and virtuous? It is strange that those who make this assertion will allow the altar at which they worship to resound with impious supplications. We say *impious*, for we have heard the fervent prayer, breathed from hearts which were apparently warmed with ardent devotion and sincerity, that the "God of the Universe would gather the whole fallen race of Adam to the paradise of bliss above," and that love and praise should fill *every* soul with joy unspeakable and full of glory.

What should we think of a number of Philanthropists, residing in a region where slavery prevails, who should send a memorial to their legislators, praying in all the earnestness of benevolence that every vassal of their land may be free, and should at the same time publish from east to west that the contemplated manumission would spread abroad a moral desolation?—that the blow which was to sever the chains of slavery would also give the death wound to virtue and happiness? Universalism productive of licentiousness! then let us not pray that it may prevail. Before this position is established it will be necessary to prove the four following particulars:

1st. A trust and confidence in the power, mercy and goodness of Jehovah are productive of sin.

2d. Prove that Universalists are all destitute of moral principle and integrity.

3d. That a faith in the promise of Jehovah to redeem all men from sin, produces disobedience and enmity towards him, and

4th. That an abiding sense of God's care and beneficence manifested to the children of his hand, are calculated to inspire those who are exercised thereby with hatred and rebellion.

We submit those propositions to the candid perusal and investigation of our opposing brethren, who so frequently affirm that the doctrine we advocate is of a "demoralizing tendency."

We have sometimes been led to contrast the declaration of the Apostle James with that of our opponents. He tells us, "Abraham believed God and it was imputed unto him for righteousness, and he was called the friend of God." Now what did Abraham believe? By turning to the 12th Chapter of Genesis we find that it was this promise which he believed: "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed," and in the 28th Chapter the same promise is repeated to Jacob, "In thee and thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Paul and James both declare that the faith of Abraham in this promise "was accounted to him for righteousness," and James adds, "he was called the friend of God." Universalists believe what the good old patriarch did, that all the families of the earth shall be blessed in the promised Savior. Then why, we ask, account their faith *unrighteousness*, and call them the *enemies* of God? If Abraham's faith was a righteous one, without the doctrine of an "endless hell," must we necessarily be wicked for "denying hell?

B. B. H.

To Correspondents.

The Essays of "J. P." will be commenced next week.

We need not repeat to Br. Spear the assurance that he is ever welcome. It is in that kind of commendation, which he is pleased to bestow, that we are now experiencing, a rich return for the dark and doubtful period we have gone through in our experiment.

RELIGIOUS NOTICES.

Ev. S. J. Hillyer will preach at North Salem, Sunday, Nov 24th; at Longridge, Sunday, December 1st, and at Bedford the same evening.

New Books.

A small supply of Murray's Life, 46 cents each; Balfour's Letters to Professor Stuart, 25 cents; and a Pamphlet entitled a "Mate to the Temperance Ox," by I. D. Williamson, Albany, 50 cents a dozen, 6 cents single, just received at this office.

Original.

THE HILL OF ZION.

Oh! Zion, when I think of thee,
I wish for pinions like a dove,
And mourn to think that I should be
So distant from the place I love.

But yet we shall behold the day,
When all thy children shall return;
Our sorrow then shall flee away
And we shall never, never mourn.

We hope that such a day will come—
It makes e'en exiles portions sweet;—
Though now we wander far from home,
In Zion, soon, we all shall meet.

M. A. T.....n.

MIDNIGHT MUSING.

I am a lover of the midnight hour. I love to sit on a cloudless summer's night, watching the heavens eloistered with tremulous stars. I love to gaze upon the serene queen of night, as she progresses along the azure vault, shedding floods of mellow light upon the world below. The effect is magical and subduing. Every thing that is touched by her silvery beams, is softened and etherealized. Then the soul sympathizes with the grandeur that nature displays.

To me there is nothing so sublime and expressive, as the silent and quiet midnight hour—and to reflect that in this deep and universal hulk, the stupendous globe, and the vast number of flashing worlds that stud the blue canopy of heaven, are performing their various evolutions under the guidance and direction of Him, at whose fiat they sprang into existence. At such a time, the soul is disengaged from every artificial excitement, and an opportunity is afforded for it to speak its own bold and original language.

Society has its charms. There is a pleasure in the flash and glare of fashion and beauty; and under their thrilling influences, those with unwithered hopes and unblasted expectations, may tread boldly on. But it seems to me, that if by some untoward accident, the conviction should fasten itself upon me that my last had come, I should require no sublimer preparation, than time spent in the perfect solitude—the vastness, grandeur, and glory of midnight! the hushed, quiet, beautiful midnight! When deep and absolute silence broods in the air, and over the earth—upon the deserted streets, and upon the temples of the living God. Is not this a dream? Will it appear otherwise when the daylight shall have come? When we shall go out and pursue the ordinary routine of business; and the street that is now deserted, shall tremble as the wheels thunder furiously over it, and its dusty tracks be thronged with avaricious men, crying money! money!! Will this dim moonlight hour appear to us then any more than a dream?

And indeed, what is our life, but a dream?—Ah! 'tis nothing more. He, who but yesterday roved the forest with us, gathering wild flowers! listening to the songs of birds, or watching the brook—bright and sunny daughter of the hill—leaping and bounding in its joyous way along the banks of emerald—pouring over the tiny cataract, its bright waters sparkling in the sun light—meandering through the vale, till it finally loses itself in the bosom of the silvery lake—has had his life blood chill'd by the touch of the cold and bony finger of death—what is left of him—but a dream?

She, by whose side we used to spend our leisure hours; whose presence was our joy, whose smile our happiness; whose eye was not exceeded in brightness by the eye of a gazelle; whose sylph-like form was unrivalled for beauty and symmetry—has departed!—Does she seem aught but a dream?

She who once loved us—whose eye followed our every movement with tenderness and anxiety—upon whose breast we reclined—from whose lips we received instruction, and upon whose knee we used to say our evening prayer, rests upon her lowly pillow. Does she not seem as a vision, the recollection of which is pleasing, yet mournful?

Hark! the clock strikes one—two!—Does the breeze waft the sound to other ears? Who also beside is now awake?

The student upon whose brow the cold sweat stands; whose bloodshot eye tells of deep, and intense thought, is now poring over his books, regardless of present ease—hoping for future fame.

But alas! all the treasure of knowledge, which he has for years been laying up, may be destroyed to-morrow by the breath of the monster.

And the debauchee stretched on the bed of flame—through whose veins the mad fever runs, whose burning temples are kissed by the breezes in mockery.

And the wife who awaits the return of him she loves, from the gaming house—the counterpart of hell.

And the young mother who wakes and sighs for the lovely babe she has just buried.

And the follower of Bacchus, who is revelling in some den of vice and ribaldry.

And the slave who starts in his sleep, shakes his chains and mutters revenge.

And the wretch immured within the dark prison walls, whose hands are red with gore, who to-morrow shall be dragged forth, with a thousand eyes bent fiercely and scoffingly upon him, to hear the judge pronounce the doom of death!—The soft moonlight falls upon these unnoticed; the beam that rests upon them is disregarded—and the world moves on—the night recedes—the stars one by one retire—the day light appears.

ADVICE TO YOUNG WIVES.

The young wife should remember that she has chosen her own lot in life; she has connected it with that of her husband, and if by the decree of an all-wise Providence, he becomes embarrassed, it is her duty to aid him by her kindness, not to mutter or oppress him by her ill-temper. Upon the male sex the task of providing the means of subsistence, is, in civilized society, almost exclusively imposed; and consequently when they become distressed, and have not wherewithall to provide for their partners, *they* suffer doubly. They have not only their own privations to regret, but yours also; and the world's frown, and the world's—oftentimes unjust—censure, falls exclusively upon the husband. The wife can hide herself from the world, but the husband must face its pride, its prosperity. May *all* young wives be permanently prosperous: but for their own sakes, and for the honor of womanhood, we admonish them not to let adversity, should it unfortunately lay its iron hand upon them, induce them to depart from that affectionate conduct, in word or deed, which they owe to their husbands; and conduct themselves in such a manner as to do away with the truth of the old proverb—"When *poverty* comes in at the door, *love* flies out at the window."

FOR SALE.

The present proprietor of the 'Religious Inquirer,' is desirous of disposing of the establishment. His reason is, he has made arrangements to remove to a distant part of the country, and of entering into another business.

The Inquirer is, at present, in good credit, and useful to the cause which it professes to advocate: Its list of subscribers is respectable, much larger than at any previous period, and it is confidently believed, that it may, with proper exertions, be increased to double the present number. A person well qualified for the business, and who could devote himself to it, would realize a generous income from the establishment. At the close of the present volume, which takes place in February next, the subscriber would be glad to relinquish it.

Any person wishing to make the purchase should make application, before the close of the present volume, and if by mail, postage must be paid. B. SPERRY.

NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER AND PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

In presenting proposals for the third vol. of the Messenger it is merely necessary to say, that no essential change will be made in the course of the paper, unless it be to avail ourselves of every possible opportunity of increasing the talent and interest in its columns. It will, therefore, in the language it has ever held forth, to the world, continue to "plead the cause of a slandered and persecuted denomination of Christians—the UNIVERSALISTS;" endeavor to inspire confidence among its friends, and to induce as far as possible the thoughtless and unconcerned, and even opposers, to come forward into the field of examination and "reason together" on the great and glorious doctrines of a *world's reconciliation to God.*

Its motto may be, perhaps, the surest index to its character. It breathes neither wrath nor fury to the chileren of men, but on the contrary, it points to a peaceful messenger on the mountain top, proclaiming "good tidings" and publishing peace." "*How beautiful upon the mountains, are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace.*"

With unfeigned gratitude to the Universalist public for the many tokens of approbation bestowed upon our paper for the 2 years it has now been in existence, we submit these Proposals for the third volume, referring simply to the past, as a pledge for the future.

CONDITIONS.

The "*N. Y. Christian Messenger and Philadelphia Universalist,*" will be published simultaneously in New-York and Philadelphia, every Saturday morning, on a royal sheet, quarto form, and close print, at $2 per annum, *in advance*, or $2 50 if not paid within the first six months.

Subscribers in New-York and Philadelphia will be promptly served by carriers, and all possible care will be observed in the Mailing department, that subscribers may regularly receive their papers.

The publishing office in New-York is at No's. 2 and 3 Marble Building, Chatham Square, and in Philadelphia, for the present, at No. 132 Chesnut-street adjoining the United States Bank. P. PRICE,
Publisher and Proprietor.

Beauties of Arminio-Calvinism.

Just published and for sale at this office, a neat 18 mo. pamphlet of 36 closely printed pages, entitled, "*The Beauties of Arminio-Calvinism; or, the story of Deacon Caleb Comfort, to which is added the vision of Deacon Peter Pious.*" This pamphlet comprises the five articles which have recently appeared in the columns of the Messenger, under the head *Five chapters on Partialism*, and are designed to exhibit the change which has come over the Presbyterian denomination within a few years. Price $4 per 100, or 6 cents single.

213 Questions *without* Answers.

This pamphlet of 12 pages, by A. C. T., may be obtained of P. Price, No. 2 Chatham Square, New-York; A. C. Thomas, 132 Chesnut St. Philadelphia, Asher Moore, Reading, Pa.; J. Grosh, Marietta, Pa, J. K. Wright, Easton, Pa.

P. PRICE, PRINTER,
Nos. 2 and 3 Marble-Building, Chatham-Square, where JOB PRINTING will be neatly executed, on reasonable terms. Orders solicited.